

E 400
.C54

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005024079





AN APPEAL

FROM

David L. Childs,

EDITOR OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD,

TO THE

ABOLITIONISTS.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

To D. L. Child—*Respected Friend*,—A few readers of the Standard in this region, who also profess friendship for our principles, have intimated a prospect of voting for Clay, and the principal reason given, is, that the Standard *has been* a very judicious paper, and that its late editor evidently means to vote for Clay, and that if *he can*, with his superior opportunities of viewing the whole question, *they can* vote for him. I think, myself, the Standard has given evidence sufficient to lead to such a conclusion, and as the truth upon the point is important, I respectfully request thee to inform thy numerous friends of the facts in the case, through either the Standard or Freeman.

Truly thy friend, J. FULTON, Jr.

Answer of D. L. Child.

To JAMES FULTON, Jr., of Ercildoun, Pa.

Dear Sir:—I consider the Annexation of Texas the most important Anti Slavery question which is, or can be agitated at this time. The champions of Slavery, the acknowledged representatives of slave interests and opinions, have declared, again and again, in public and in private, in speeches, resolutions, editorials, toasts, and official documents, that this measure is vital to the existence of Slavery—so vital that they will have it, with or *without* Union. They do not overrate its importance.

Distinguished Southerners of all parties have admitted, without a dissenting voice, that Slavery must come to a speedy end in the old slave States, and would, in fact, have come to an end long ago, were it not for the *American slave-trade*. Mr. Wise, in his report at the late session of Congress,

in favor of continuing the gag rule, lays down this proposition as unquestionable, that to prohibit the American slave trade would be equivalent to the Abolition of Slavery. The results of the last census show, that during the ten years, from 1830 to 1840, 321,063 slaves were transferred from the slave raising to the slave consuming States, and that *sixteen thousand* were used up, i. e. brought to premature death, by overtasking, underfeeding, cruel punishment and sudden violence. This is more than half the number slain at the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, at the name of which, the world still shudders.

The value of the slaves thus transferred, chiefly by means of the American slave trade, estimated at the price of the market whence they are carried, is \$160,531,500, exceeding by \$130,531,500 the total value of all the slaves obtained by all nations, during the same period, from Africa. If the comparatively small sum of thirty millions could tempt the African chiefs and kidnappers to perpetrate the enormities which make that continent a bed of torture to its children, to what excesses may not a hundred and sixty millions impel Christian slave masters and traders—

"A race more polished, more severe than they."

The foregoing results are based upon the actual number of the slaves in 1840, without taking into account what that number ought to have been. It is obvious that there ought to have been a proportional increase of slaves, *equal*, at least, to that of the whites, because it is a common, and I will say, an impudent boast of many of the slaveholders,

that the absence of all care and anxiety about providing for the future, is a compensation for the loss of liberty! This is the happiness of swine. To a certain extent it probably exists, and, if there were no counteracting causes, it would tell upon the rate of increase. That rate, however, with the slaves, has been a little short of *twenty-five per cent.* in the last ten years, while, with the whites, it has been almost *thirty-five*. The difference is *fully ten per cent* making the increase of the slaves, during that period, 199,354 less than it should have been, according to the ratio of the increase of whites. *But the slaves ought to increase faster than the whites*, because the extraordinary stimulus applied in the slave raising States to the production of them for the market, causes a larger proportion of slave children to come into the world, than there is of white. Thus the two last censuses, the only ones which have classed the slaves "under ten," show a proportional excess of this class over the corresponding white one, of *two per cent.* in ten years. If this excess continued, as it should, through all the subsequent classes of slaves, they would have increased, from 1830 to 1840, more by 39,870 than they would have done by the white ratio. The whole lack of just increase of the slaves during the ten years preceding the last census, was therefore no less than 239,224. The extinguishment of the reproductive power, especially under circumstances which should give it extraordinary activity and scope, is as positive and conclusive evidence of the destructive effects of slavery, and of the American slave trade, as the immolation of those who actually come into being. This is the view of the subject under its physical aspect. But what a mass of guilt and woe is concealed from human ken, under this superficiality; what heavy wrongs done and suffered by man; how many generations heart broken!

There are constant accessions to the number of our slaves by illicit importations from the island of Cuba or the coast of Africa. There is abundant evidence that these accessions are considerable.—How can it be otherwise, when a slave in that island is worth, as a general thing, only *half*, and on the coast of Africa, only *twenty-fifth* as much as in the United States? I have estimated the value of a slave on the coast at \$20, a high price for the quarter, and probably never given, except in haste to complete a cargo. The ordinary price is a *musket*, and sometimes a *gallon of New-England rum*. Of all merchandize, men are the most convenient to smuggle,—they may be quickly loaded by boats on a desert coast; and they transport themselves without roads. They are also loaded at sea into some light craft, which runs up the

rivers by night and descending by day, disposes of them as if they were brought down from Kentucky, Tennessee, or the interior of an Atlantic State. The increase from this source, and consequently the increased expenditure of life, which it would show, cannot be ascertained.

If the American slave trade should cease, slavery would speedily be abolished in all the slave raising, &c. in all the farming slave States. This is so invariably admitted by Southern men, that I shall not present the abundant proof thereof, which is at hand. Mr. CLAY, in an address delivered before the Colonization Society of Kentucky, in 1829, said:—

"Farming agriculture cannot sustain it, [the price of slaves,] for it is believed that nowhere in the farming portion of the United States, could slave labor be generally employed, if the proprietor were not tempted to raise slaves by the high price of the Southern markets, which keeps it up in his own."

Thomas J. Randolph, a grandson of Jefferson, said in the Virginia House of Delegates, in 1832:—

"It is a practice, and an increasing practice, in parts of Virginia, to rear slaves for the market—How can an honorable mind, a patriot, and a lover of his country, bear to see this ancient dominion converted into one grand menagerie * * * where men are to be reared for the market like oxen for the shambles. Is it better, is it not worse, than the slave trade, that trade which enlisted the good and wise of every creed and every clime to abolish it! The trader receives the slave a stranger in language, aspect and manner, from the merchant who has brought him from the interior. The title of father, mother, husband and child, have all been rent in twain; his soul has become callous. Here, sir, individuals, whom the master has known from infancy, whom he has seen sporting in the innocent gambols of childhood, who have been accustomed to look to him for protection, he tears from the mother's arms and sells into a strange country, among strange people, subject to cruel task masters! In my opinion, sir, it is much worse."

In 1833, Mr. Harrison, of Virginia, said: *
"We state it as the result of extensive inquiries, embracing the last fifteen years, that a great proportion of the plantations, with from fifty to one hundred slaves, actually bring their proprietors in debt at the end of a short term of years, notwithstanding what would once have been deemed in Virginia very sheer economy."

Tobacco was the only article, which would by possibility justify the expense of slave labor in Virginia; and now we see the wiser planters are to a great degree withdrawing their lands from it."

"We will now let the reader into the secret of slaveholding economy. The only form in which it can safely be said that slaves on a plantation are profitable in Virginia, is in the multiplication of their numbers by births." "The process of multiplication will not in this way, [that of farm labor,] advance the master towards the point of a net revenue. He is not richer in income with fifty slaves than with twenty. Yet these young negroes have

their value; and what value? The value of slaves is the certain price for which they will at any time sell to the Southern trader." "That master alone finds productive value in the increase of his slaves, who chooses to turn them at regular intervals into money at the highest market price."

"If all these sales were the result of the necessity of the masters, while it must forever be lamented, it would at the same time be the most portentous proof of the financial ruin of the planters of the State. But if otherwise, but a common course of business, regularly gone into for profit, what volumes does it speak of the degradation to which slavery may reduce its supporters! and will 'the aspiring blood of Lancaster' endure it to be said that a *Guinea* is to be found in America, and that *Guinea* is Virginia? That children are reared with the express object of sale into distant regions, and that in numbers but little less than the whole number of annual births? It may be that there is a small section of Virginia, (perhaps we could indicate it,) where the theory of population is studied with reference to the yearly income from the sale of slaves."

I suppose the writer to allude here to the *Old Eastern Shore*, a part of the district which has given us *Tyler, Upsher and Wise*.

"Mr. Marshall, (son of the late Chief Justice,) has told us that by the census of 1830, the number of slaves in Eastern Virginia under *ten years of age*, exceeds that of whites of the same age more than 31,000."

I remark here that the *whole* white population of Eastern Virginia is nearly equal to the whole slave population of the same district.

Mr. Harrison continues:

"*Shut up all outlet into the Southern and Southern States, and the price of slaves in Virginia would sink down to a cypher.*"

On this point Mr. Clay also, four years earlier, said:

"That adult slaves will in process of time sink in value even below a hundred dollars each. I have not a doubt. This result may not be brought about by the termination of the first period of their redemption, but that it will come, at some subsequent and not distant period, I think perfectly clear."

By the successive acquisitions of Louisiana, Florida, and the Indian reservations, and by the prohibition of the foreign slave-trade, a prodigious impulse was given to the American slave trade. It is no wonder therefore that the highly penal statutes against the foreign slave trade, which a Virginian has told us is less inhuman and demoralizing, have all originated with Virginia. The value of an American slave as estimated by Mr. Clay in 1830, was thirty-three times as great as the estimate made in Congress in 1790, on the occasion of the presentation of the first petition on the subject of slavery. No other species of property of vast extent, has ever been enhanced at such a rate in this country, or perhaps in the world. This has been wholly the result of the action of the government. At the instance of the American slave raiser, Congress gave

him a monopoly, guarding it by the highest sanction known to the law. At the instance of the cotton grower, a high protective duty was laid on cotton in the first revenue law, which was the second act passed under the present Constitution; and that duty has remained ever since, except when it was reduced under the compromise act, whereupon several of the Southern presses, with the tacit acquiescence of the whole South, called loudly for its restoration. The vast acquisitions of territory made at the common expense, have redounded chiefly to the advantage of the slave interest. Several of them were made upon the demand of slaveholders and avowedly for their benefit. As to Louisiana I shall let Mr. Clay speak. Having been cotemporary with the transaction, and even then a conspicuous and influential man, and having always been in a position to observe the movement of the slave market, his statements are invested with the highest authority. In the discourse already referred to, he says:

"Prior to the annexation of Louisiana to the United States, the supply of slaves from Africa was abundant. The price of adults was generally about \$100.—a price less than the cost of raising an infant."

"After the United States abolished the slave trade the price of adults rose very considerably."

"What has tended to sustain the price of slave in the United States, has been that very fact of the acquisition of Louisiana, but especially the increasing demand for cotton. The price of cotton, a much more extensive object of culture than the sugarcane, regulates the price of slaves as unerringly as any one subject whatever is regulated by any standard."

In the face of these facts, a large portion of the slaveholders have always, except during the period of the war, embargo, and non-intercourse, complained, and are now more than usually complaining that they are impoverished by the government!

The price of slaves has declined since 1836—and it will probably never rise again to the mark of that day, unless new and extensive territory, adapted to the culture of colonial articles—but especially to sugar, shall be obtained.

Since the year 1830, two States, Georgia and Tennessee, have been added to the slave exporting States. There are now but five States and one Territory, which are strictly slave consuming; and two of these, Alabama and Mississippi, have long prohibited the introduction of slaves for sale. There remain now only Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas and Florida, into which a slave can be lawfully introduced for sale. Missouri is a farming State, and will soon export slaves. Arkansas is more a farming than a planting State, and will never be of much consideration as a slave market. Florida, though possessed of some good planting lands, is generally

sandy or marshy, and offers still less than Arkansas, an encouraging prospect to the slave raiser. Louisiana has once passed a law prohibiting, as so many other States have done, the domestic slave trade in words, while they all leave it open outwards. Louisiana repealed that law, in consequence, as it was said, of the cholera. I am suspicious, however, that it was more to reconcile free traders and nullifiers to the protection of the sugar interest, by holding out to them the prospect of an increasing consumption of slaves. There is no employment of slaves so destructive of life, as on the sugar plantations. The most eminent sugar planters of Louisiana have declared, and the House of Representatives have published it to the world,* that the annual loss on their estates "by deterioration" of the slaves is *nine per cent.* According to a letter of a Georgia sugar planter, Thomas Spaulding, contained in the same Congressional document, the slaves, if not overworked or otherwise badly used, are healthier, and multiply faster on a sugar plantation, than upon any other. This tells badly for the humanity of sugar planters, who use slave labor, because in every country and colony they do so manage as to make the sweetest of all products the bitterest to the freedman. The sugar cane kills the slave cultivator and manufacturer, and prevents "multiplying and replenishing," at such a rate that in from seven to ten years the plantations would be depopulated, if it were not for the annual accession of new victims.

This was the argument presented by the Louisianians to the free traders and nullifiers, to induce them to relax the sternness of their patriotism in favor of an industry so meritorious. The planters succeeded, and obtained, and have always obtained, a protection of *fifty to seventy-five per cent.* Even "the prince of nullifiers," and "king that shall be" of the new Southwestern and Texas free trade slave confederacy, being inquired of by the sugar planters, as candidate for the presidency, what were his views respecting the protection of domestic industry, declared only eighteen months ago that he was in favor of a strictly revenue tariff, but "in the exercise of a sound discretion," and "with the scope which the rule will admit, he would take pleasure in *protecting* the great staple" of Louisiana!

In view of the rapid transition of the slave States from slave consuming to slave exporting States, and of the decline of the price of slaves and of cotton, there cannot be a doubt that the American slave market has touched its limit within our present territory. This is further illustrated by a curious historical series. It was sixteen years after

the establishment of the government that Louisiana was acquired. Sixteen years after that event we obtained Florida, and just sixteen years after that the revolt of Texas, devised by slaveholders, aided by all the influence of the government, as the sole means left them of obtaining that territory, took place. There would seem to be something operating with the force and precision of a physical law to bring around in this cycle, a new demand for slave territory. Had it not been for former acquisitions, slavery would have been abolished before now in Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, North-Carolina and Kentucky, and in some of them long ago. I have been informed that this is the opinion of Mr. Clay. New and powerful causes are now operating to precipitate this event, and, in the sequel, to carry emancipation, without pausing upon the frontier, into the very heart of the intended nullification confederacy. These causes are, want of variety in the objects of slave cultivation, coupled with the inaptitude and insecurity of slaves as manufacturers; the over production of cotton, the establishment by the British ministry and Parliament of the principle of laying differential duties in favor of free labor, and the competition now mustering in the populous and vast territories of British India, a competition which will undoubtedly be aided at an early day by the application of the differential principle, and aggravated by Texas itself if it remain independent. And here I will utter my first word for the special benefit of the Texans. It is this: Calhoun has declared repeatedly that *he wishes them to be reconquered by Mexico, rather than remain independent.* The knaves may rely upon this.

In the Virginia Convention of 1829, Mr. Upshur, the negotiator of the Texas treaty, said:

"The value of slaves as an article of property, depends much on the state of the market abroad. Nothing is more fluctuating than the value of slaves. A late law of Louisiana reduced their value *twenty-five per cent.* in two hours after its passage was known. *If it should be our lot to acquire the country of Texas their price will rise again.*"

From these considerations, I lay down with great confidence, this proposition, that in the present state, and with the present tendency of the slave market, the slave raising States will soon address themselves in earnest to the task of abolishing slavery. They will have no alternative but this—emancipation or general bankruptcy, together with daily increasing danger of insurrection from the accumulation of slaves without the possibility of a drain. The fulfilment of John Randolph's prediction will then come, and masters, instead of slaves, be advertised as "runaways."

But let Texas be annexed, and the face of things

* Document 62, House of Representatives 21st Congress, 2d Session.

will be changed as if by magic. The effect of it to enhance and sustain the price of slaves, will be greater, and probably more lasting, than that of all our other acquisitions of slave territory. Texas, as defined by act of its Congress, and as we shall acquire it, (if we of the free States are capable of such disinterested villainy,) will form as Col. Benton acknowledges, "a great many States." It contains 380,000 square miles, being nearly twice the extent of France, nine times that of New-York, nine times that of Pennsylvania, ten times that of Ohio, and fifty times that of Massachusetts! Mr. Clay has said that it would form five States. He undoubtedly meant Texas proper, extending only to the river *Medina*, which divides it from Coahuila, and not including the portions of that and of three other States of Mexico, which the said Congress have coolly "annexed" to Texas. Certainly such an act is as laughable as it is impudent. Still there can be no doubt, that if we once pass the *Sabine*, we shall not halt till we reach the Rio Bravo. This has always been the limit to which the usurpers, for the present, aspired. If we conclude to rob at all, we shall not boggle at the trifling question of more or less. This vast territory, except a corner in the Northwest not large enough for more than one State, lies south of *thirty-six and a half degrees* of North latitude, and according to the law passed, as part of the Missouri compromise, may all be made into slave States. If one side of the compromise was that slavery should not pass north of that line, the other was that it may march up to it. If through blindness, corruption, or pusillanimity, we shall, with all our past experience, and present light, permit Texas to be annexed, we shall, with still more facility, permit it to be overrun by slavery. Considering "what manner of spirit" it is, which slavery nourishes, the immense accession of political power, and the security for continued political ascendancy which it would acquire; considering how difficult, and for the most part vain, we and our fathers have found it to resist its engrossing and tyrannical temper and pretensions, although in our fathers' day there were but a quarter as many slaves as now, and no cotton at all—I should utterly despair, if Texas is annexed, of ever seeing any barrier erected either within, or beyond that territory, which the invading surge would not soon sweep away.

Mr. Walker, a member of the Senate from Mississippi, has put forth the theory that if Texas is acquired, slavery will flow into it from the existing States, and, passing the ultimate Southwestern boundary of the Union, will diffuse itself in the persons of "free blacks, augmented in the slave States," over Mexico, and Central and South America. He does not suggest any way in which slaves

are to be converted into freemen in those States.—Manumission is prohibited by law in nearly every one of them, and without exception in the planting States. But if manumission were free, would it be increased by opening a new market, and enhancing the price of slaves? Common sense teaches, and experience proves, that the increase of free blacks is in inversely as value of slaves. Undoubtedly the slaves would "diffuse" themselves very quick over Mexico, or over Patagonia, if water were permitted to find its level, and the slaves to elope. But one of the original, and most malignant causes of the conspiracy to rob Mexico of her territory, was, that she could neither be wheedled nor threatened into an engagement to surrender fugitive slaves. During fifteen years our slave masters, masters of this government and people, persisted in pressing upon Mexico this impudent pretension. Her reply was, that "slavery was a palpable violation of the first principles of a free republic." Mr. Benton, who started, and recently boasted in the Senate of having started the project of annexation, alleged in the beginning, as one reason, the danger of the elopement of slaves from our Southwestern States into Texas, in which, by the laws of Mexico, slavery had been abolished. The Southern press shouted a fierce assent. A slaveholding republic, they said, could not bear the juxtaposition of a republic which had abolished slavery. The late Secretary of State, Mr. Upshur, in his correspondence with our Minister at London, urged the same thing as a reason, and as constituting a necessity, for annexation. This is the delirium of a pro slavery brain-fever; for the difficulty is not removed by annexing Texas, nor can it be without extending the slave States to Terra del Fuego, to Dutch Guiana, and Brazil! In fact there is no doubt that the authors of this immoderate and shameless scheme of iniquity, seriously cherish the idea of an indefinite aggrandizement of the slave power, by boundless conquests in the southwest; and if they can accomplish the *first step*, it is probable that their idea will be realized. Mr. Wise, in his speech in favor of war with Great Britain and Mexico, delivered in the House of Representatives in 1812, declared that "Slavery should pour itself out without restraint, and find no limit but the Southern ocean." The late Mr. Gilmer, ex-governor of Virginia, and Secretary of the Navy, said in his celebrated letter on Annexation, in 1843, that "the pioneer from our seaboard would soon kindle his fire on the Gulf of California." Mr. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, alluding incidentally to Texas, in his speech on Oregon, delivered in the Senate in March last, said that "Providence had given us the mission of carrying civilization and Christianity throughout this continent, and we could

Pitiful and palpable as these schemes of swindling are, they are nevertheless formidable. Tens of thousands of adventurers in them are dispersed throughout the country, and are operating in disguise. I am informed by Southern Whigs that most of the leading friends of Annexation in that quarter have tickets in these lotteries.* They are active, clamorous, and, of course, unscrupulous — They urge the people to go Annexation for the aggrandizement and greater security of our rising Republic. They tell them that it will extend civilization, republican institutions, and Christianity, and open a new and profitable market for the products of our factories.

* * * * *

The insulting appeal to the cupidity of "Eastern manufacturers" originated with the late Governor and Secretary Gilmer. It was repeated often by the late Secretary Upshur, a *nullifier*, and most elaborately urged by Walker a *free trade man*. I have been informed that there are manufacturers and merchants who are eying this bait, and are prepared to jump at it. Is it possible that Northern manufacturers can believe that nullifiers and free-traders are going to rob Mexico to enrich them? The argument in its best aspect comes to this, that it is good policy to go to war for the capturing of consumers! This would be a new ground of war, and a new kind of protection, as *new* as the protectors themselves. It is supposed that there are not above one hundred thousand inhabitants in Texas, and probably half of them are slaves. Slaves are not permitted to be large consumers. If we are to fight

* I formerly sought, by all the means in my power, for authentic information on this subject, with a view of enabling the people to estimate aright the motives of leading Annexationists; but I met with insuperable difficulties. The dealers, the agents, and most of the holders, "love darkness rather than light." From time to time I have learned to my satisfaction, that the following persons are or were largely interested:

"Upshur and Gilmer, late Secretaries of State and the Navy. J. R. Poinsett and Anthony Pickens, former Ministers of the United States to Mexico. Duff Green, an honor of the expelled title on which the Texas Treaty professed to be founded, and father of Benjamin E. Green, now acting in the double capacity of Consul of the United States and Texas Spy in Mexico. Gilbert L. Thompson, Captain Tyler's messenger to Mexico. R. J. Walker, Senator from Mississippi. A son of Thomas Ritchie, editor of the *Richmond Enquirer*. Samuel Starbuck, late Collector of New-York; a town in Texas has been named in his honor. Wm. C. Preston of South Carolina, who has received the like honor. Wm. Price, late District Attorney, New-York. Col. Webb, of the Courier and Enquirer, New-York. E. J. Holmes and James Hamilton, both of South Carolina."

The editor of the Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass. was called upon by a citizen of that county, some weeks ago, who expressed himself earnestly in favor of Annexation. The editor pressed him to tell the reason of his advocating a measure so unjust to Mexico and so discreditable to our country, extending and perpetuating as it evidently would, the curse of slavery. He replied, "I will be honest about it. I own land in Texas."

for consumers, it would be worth a while to consider whether it would not be wiser to conquer China, where there are enough of them to make it an object. Or, if the views of nullifiers to the benefit of "Eastern manufacturers," are too moderate for this, they might at least make a treaty with *Hayti*, which would, without the expense and hazards of war, secure us more customers than there are inhabitants in Texas. There is still another peaceful and infallible method of making a market for "Eastern manufactures." It is found that the emancipated negroes of the British West Indies consume *four times* the quantity of manufactures that they did as slaves. If these Southern gentlemen wish to provide consumers of "Eastern manufactures," let them convert their slaves into freemen. It would probably increase the demand for clothing at least \$50,000,000 per annum!

During the last winter I conversed much with the ablest and fastest friends of protection in both Houses of Congress, and there was not one who did not set it down as certain, that Annexation would seal the doom of our Northern industry. Many of them, not hitherto friendly to abolition, admitted that Abolitionists had detected and exposed the secret cause of the war which the Southern slavholders, aided by their Northern understrappers, have waged upon Northern industry through the instrumentality of capricious and deleterious legislation. If "Eastern manufacturers" and merchants are deceived by a trick so maladroït,

* Duller should they be than the fat weed,

* That rot itself in ease on Lethe's wharf."

And if mental incubility, be, as is alleged, a justification for enslaving men, they would deserve to receive chains, whips, and tasks, on the plantation of a Texan brigand.

* * * * *

But it is urged that Annexation will be the means of abolishing Slavery in the old Slaves as fast as it will establish it in new ones. What then do we gain for liberty and humanity, especially as slaves are treated much more cruelly in planting than in farming States? But these men tell us that annexation will *build up* "Eastern manufactures;" then why not also the *Southern*? The annexation of Texas would have about the same tendency to abolish Slavery in the old slave States, that opening a new market for wool, and prohibiting the importation of wool and woollens, *under penalty of death*, would have to abolish wool-growing in New-England and New-York!

* * * * *

We are told that Texas was once ours—"all our own," to use a favorite phrase of Mr. Walker. Hence he calls the proposed robbery, *re-annexation*, and thereupon the "harmonious Democracy" sing

re, re, re. This was the name given by the Egyptian priests to the sun, considered as a divinity; and it has become the pole-star of the annexation jugglers. It seems to be supposed that this imposture will enlist national pride in the service of private speculation, and of slaveholding ambition and rapacity. There no more reason for the prefix in the case of Texas, than there would be if it were a question of annexing Botany Bay. It is pretended that Texas was a part of Louisiana, and was included in our purchase of that province. But in truth we never had any title, whatever, to Texas. France, of whom we purchased Louisiana, had held that province from 1682 to 1763, when she ceded it to Spain, but received it back in 1800. France never possessed Texas, and never claimed any right to it. The proof of this is:

1. The absence of all record, memorandum, or tradition of such possession, or claim.

2. Positive facts, which show that neither the one nor the other were ever thought of by France, and that Spain and Mexico had the original possession, and have always maintained it.

La Salle, in his search by sea for the mouth of the Mississippi, with a view of establishing a colony there, missed the point of his destination, and reached the coast about a hundred miles too far west; but supposing himself to be still east of the Mississippi, he coasted westward, until despairing for the time of finding the object of his search, he landed and built a fort merely for protection against Indians at the Bay of St. Bernard, now *Matagorda*. From that place he journeyed on feet along the margin of the bay, to the eastward, still hoping that it would prove the outlet of one of the mouths of the Mississippi. When this hope failed, he set out on a journey towards Illinois and Canada, in both which he had friends and resources. His aim was still to carry out the design of his voyage, viz: exploration, and colonization at the mouth of the Mississippi. He proceeded northeasterly, and having passed the Colorado, the Brazos, and Trinity rivers, and approached the present frontier of the United States, at a place supposed to be near the head waters of the *Salado*, he was compelled, by desertion of his men, and failure of ammunition, to retrace his steps to the fort. On a subsequent journey, which he immediately undertook over the same route, he was murdered by some of his own men, not far from the river Brazos. On the river Trinity, La Salle found a numerous nation of Indians called *Cenis*, who were possessed of various articles, which undoubtedly came from the Mexican Spaniards, such as *horses, deer spoons, clothes, and pieces of money*. The Mexican Spaniards having learned that Frenchmen had penetrated to these Indians, sent a strong

military detachment to that nation, and took the survivors prisoners. The survivors of the party left in the fort, which in the meantime had been destroyed by the neighboring Indians,* were also taken, and the whole conducted as prisoners to the city of Mexico. Two of them were imprisoned for a time, and then condemned to work in the mines, where it is supposed they ended their days. The others were taken into the service of the Viceroy. The French Government made no complaint of these proceedings, although the expedition was fitted out by it; nor was any claim made for the surrender of the prisoners. Louis XIV. was not a monarch to submit silently to such an indignity as he would have deemed this treatment of his subjects and servants, and this violation of his territory, had he considered it his territory.

The only foundation for the assumption that the territory was once ours, is the instructions given by Mr. Jefferson to our ministers to Spain and Great Britain, Monroe, Pinckney and Bowdoin, who attempted to negotiate at Paris an adjustment of our boundaries with Spain. In a letter to Mr. Bowdoin on the 10th of July, 1806, Mr. Jefferson said:

"With respect to our western boundary, your instructions will be your guide. I will only add, as a comment to them, that we are attached to the retaining the Bay of St. Bernard, because it was the first establishment of the unfortunate La Salle, was the cradle of Louisiana, and more incontestably covered and conveyed to us by France under that name, than any other spot in the country."

In another letter, written September 17, 1806, Mr. Jefferson said:

"Although we considered our title good as far as the Rio Bravo, yet in proportion to what they [our negotiators] could obtain east of the Mississippi, they were to relinquish to the westward, and successive sacrifices were marked out, of which the Colorado was not the last."

At this time, Napoleon was at the height of his power. He had got the royal family of Spain into his toils, and his will was as sovereign at the Escurial as at the Tuilleries. The policy of Mr. Jefferson seems to have been to make use of the ascendancy of Napoleon to extort from Spain a western boundary, which should include Texas, and if possible, much more; in fact all that the modest Congressmen of Texas have so "annexed."

Now, that Mr. Jefferson himself did not believe that our claim had any validity whatever, we have decisive proof from himself. In a secret message transmitted by him to Congress, on the 6th day of December, 1805, he said:—

"Our line to the west was one which would have left us but a *string of land* on the Mississippi."

* The Mexican writers state that the fort was captured by the Spanish troops, but I have preferred to follow the account given by Mr. Sparks. *Am. Biog.* vol. ix. p. 175.

The message related to the settlement of difficulties existing between us and Spain, in relation to the boundaries of Louisiana. The message made no specific recommendation, but it was privately disclosed to the Committee to which it was referred; that the object was to obtain an appropriation of *two millions of dollars*. John Randolph, Chairman of the Committee, waited on Mr. Jefferson on the same day, and was informed by him that the money was wanted for the purchase of Florida. Mr. Randolph refused to support the proposition, unless the President would say this officially. At the meeting of the Committee on the next day, December 7th, Mr. Bidwell, of Massachusetts, construed the message into a requisition of money for *foreign intercourse*. Mr. Randolph moved that the use of the sum proposed, viz: two millions, be limited to the specific object of purchasing Florida, which was agreed to in Committee, but the limitation was stricken out in the House. The bill was taken up in secret session, and Mr. Varnum of Massachusetts, stated that the measure was in conformity with the secret views of the Executive. It was passed in secret, and two millions of the people's money submitted to Executive discretion. *It was immediately sent to Bonaparte*, for what purpose, has not been disclosed, and will probably never be authentically known. Mr. Randolph, theretofore, an ardent friend and supporter of Jefferson, resisted the whole proceeding, and after it was consummated, denounced it in a pamphlet to the people.

Louisiana was never described, either by La Salle, when he took possession of it, or by the French while they possessed it, except as the country watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries. This of course does not include Texas, none of its rivers being connected, directly, or indirectly, with the Mississippi. It was ceded by France to Spain, retroceded by Spain to France, and ceded by France to the United States, with no description, but that of "the province of Louisiana, as previously possessed" by the successive grantors.

The French writers speak of La Salle's journeys in Texas as having been performed *in Mexico*. La Salle himself took no formal possession of the Bay of St. Bernard. In 1838 Mr. Adams, who knows as much about this matter as any man living, declared in the House of Representatives, that "this very claim (to Texas) was as flimsy a claim as was ever set up by one nation against another;" and no member, rabid as many were for the acquisition, ventured to gainsay it. Two years before, he had stated in the same place, that Mr. Monroe, who negotiated the purchase of Louisiana—who was one of the negotiators in Spain and at Paris in 1805-6, and who had followed this question of the

boundary line of Louisiana from the beginning of it to the end, declared at the time of the Florida treaty that "he had no confidence in the claim." And yet because Mr. Adams, acting as attorney to the government, (under a wretched and disreputable custom of Christian diplomacy,) advanced litigiously a claim to the province, he has been quoted as decisive authority in favor of our pretended right, and of the proposed re-clamation. This is another of the disgusting impositions attempted to be practised by Polkers and speculators upon the people.

In 1806, a body of Spanish troops passed the *Sabine*, and General Wilkinson; Commander-in-Chief of U. S. A. was sent by our Government to repel them. In the orders, issued by General Dearborn, Secretary of War, by "special" direction of Mr. Jefferson, Wilkinson was instructed to explain to the Governor of Texas, "that the quiet possession of the country by the United States, *east of the Sabine*, (with the trifling exception of the place called Bayou Pierre,) ought, and will be considered as fully within the limits of the country, surrendered to us on taking possession of Natchitoches; and therefore, any attempt of his Catholic Majesty's officers to disturb the existing state of things, by endeavoring to occupy any new post east of the Sabine, must be considered by the Government of the United States as an actual invasion of our territorial rights, and will be resisted as such."

This letter was dated May 6, 1806. General Wilkinson marched towards the Sabine, but the Spanish having retired to the west bank of the river, no collision took place, and it was immediately agreed between him and Herera, Governor of Texas, that both parties should regard "as disputed territory," a strip of land extending about forty miles *east of the Sabine*, i. e. to a conventional line up to which the Spanish claimed, and had undoubtedly possessed, for they had an old missionary establishment a few miles west of Natchitoches, called *Maria Santissima de Guadalupe*, founded in 1715. In that year, four Frenchmen, having passports from the Governor of Louisiana, entered Texas for the purpose of buying cattle at the Spanish missions. They were immediately sent by the authorities of Texas to the city of Mexico, agreeably to the habitual policy pursued by the Spanish colonial government, of excluding all foreigners. It is scarcely necessary to say that these passports were evidence enough that the French Governor considered the men as not about to journey in *Louisiana*.

The conventional line run from the Gulf of Mexico, between the rivers Calcasieu and Mermento, northwardly a few miles west of Natchitoches, to the Red River. Wilkinson and his aid-de-camp, Col. Burling, speak of the territory west of the

Sabine, as "undisputed territory of Mexico."—Wilkinson also says in his memoirs, that the convention concluded by him and Governor Herrera, "was respected by the Spaniards, but little regard was paid to it by citizens of the United States;" and that "subsequent to this incident, sundry aggressions have been made on the province of Texas by our citizens in that quarter, not under the authority of the Government, but it is presumed with their connivance." This is the testimony of the Commander-in-Chief of our army.

In the Florida negotiation, the Spanish Plenipotentiary claimed to the line above described, but Mr. Adams objected that this was not a convenient boundary, and the Sabine was ultimately adopted. Here was a donation of a tract of land large enough for several counties, for the sole purpose of accommodating us with a satisfactory boundary.

This is the substance of the case, and I now leave it to all honest or decent men to treat this re-imposition with the contempt it merits.

* * * * *

Were there no other objection to the Annexation of Texas than the scheme originated in a vile and stupendous fraud and conspiracy, it would be sufficient for me. Mr. Berton informed us in his late speech, that in 1819 he denounced the Florida Treaty as throwing away Texas, and that he then began to write in the St. Louis newspapers in favor of its re-annexation. There is nothing in this to boast of. It is not the only instance in which he has furnished falsehood and sophistry for newspapers, and labored, to the best of his ability, to pervert the public mind. It is remarkable, however, that in that very year, a person went out from the city of St. Louis to Mexico, and by representing to the Spanish Government that the Catholics were persecuted in the United States, obtained leave to found a colony in Texas as an asylum for them.—Hence that condition, so well known, that the settlers should be none but Catholics. This is the explanation of the singular and unprecedented fact that the Spanish Government should have admitted foreigners to obtain a footing in one of its American colonies. The land was granted by the Catholic King for pious and charitable uses. I am impressed with the belief that this movement was the result of a plot, made by slaveholders and squatters, even to that early day, to get an entering wedge, with a view of ultimately dismembering and depopulating Mexico. Americans had for many years been trying in vain to make lodgment in Texas. The time, the place, the false pretence, have irresistibly made this impression.

I will not enter into the disgusting details of the ingratitude, treachery, rapacity, fraud, and violence,

which have characterized every step in the preparation and progress of the revolt. I have so often dwelt upon these, particularly in a pamphlet published at Washington, winter before last, entitled, "The Texas Revolution," that I will not now go over them again. Suffice it to say, that in February, 1830, an extensive conspiracy was found to exist in the United States, with a complete organization, and a cypher for correspondence, the object of which was the dismemberment of Mexico, and the annexation of a part thereof to the United States; that Sam Houston was the active head, but Gen. Jackson, then President of the United States, the secret soul of it; that the conspirators in the United States, in Texas, in the Cabinet at Washington, and in our Legation at Mexico, acted in concert to carry out the design; that intrigue and corruption extending to the offers of *bribes to the amount of half a million of dollars*, were tried in vain; that the definitive failure of all other means of obtaining the territory, was the signal for raising the standard of revolt; that Sam Houston went to Texas in 1830, to prepare for that contingency; that he gave out to his friends and confederates that "he was in possession of the private views of the President of the United States;" that Houston and his accomplices fomented the insurrectionary spirit, caused in a certain portion of the Texans by the laws of Mexico, prohibiting the introduction of slaves, and finally, in the year 1829, abolishing slavery; that the American emigrants to Texas were treated with extraordinary hospitality and generosity by the Mexicans; that the pretenses of the revolt were false and groundless; that it was not the legitimate settlers of Texas, but conspirators and intruders from the United States, who made the revolution; that, on the contrary, a majority of those settlers were averse from it, and opposed it as far as they could without danger of lynch law; that arms, munitions, men, and money, were openly furnished by slaveholders, and Texas landscriptholders in the United States, in open violation of the law of nations, of our municipal law, and of our treaties with Mexico; that no attempt was made by the authorities of the United States to execute the laws and treaties, but, on the contrary, the utmost countenance, constantly accompanied by the fairest professions of friendship to Mexico, and of the strictest regard to our neutral duties, to her, was given to the insurgents by those authorities; that an army under Gen. Gaines was ordered into Texas by Gen. Jackson, under false pretences, in further and most flagrant violation of the law of nations, and of solemn treaties; that attempts were made, first by President Jackson, and afterwards by President Van Buren to get up a war with Mexico, to cover under

the less odious name of conquest, the original and long standing project of obtaining more slave territory ; and finally that the slaveholders, the Locofocoes, and John Tyler, have labored to excite the West on the subject of Oregon, and the whole country on the subject of the British claim of visitation for the detection of slave-trading pirates, with the intent to get the United States into a war with Great Britain and Mexico, chiefly for the purpose of consummating the grand conspiracy for obtaining Texas, and extending and perpetuating Slavery.

Now, therefore, if Slavery could be laid out of the question, I for one would oppose Annexation to my last breath. Eternal justice, the violated laws of hospitality, the discouragement of ingratitude and fraud, the moral sentiment, and the universal interests of mankind demand that this hideous mass of crime should be suppressed, and a world nuisance abated. All this will speedily be done, unless the criminals are protected with the broad shield, and taken to the bosom of this Republic; which may God of his infinite mercy forever avert.

* * * *

For fifteen years I have striven according to my humble means, at home and abroad, in public and in private, by speech and by press, to expose and defeat these frightful and stupendous machinations. And now, when a great and honorable, and I trust invincible party, with a statesman of unimpeachable integrity, unsurpassed ability, and powerful character at their head, have come up to the same work, is it my abolition brethren who require me to turn from our enemy, and fight our auxiliaries ?

My position or my principles are not changed.—The change is in others, not in me, and it is for them to justify the aid they are indirectly lending to a party, the most deadly and insidious in its hostility to justice, liberty, philanthropy, peace, and progress.

The Whigs, in my opinion, are the only sincere and true Democrats. For ten years and upwards they have acted, though not as often and thoroughly as they ought, and as I wished, yet they have acted repeatedly and powerfully in defence of human rights, and more especially for the conservation of the great constitutional instrumentalities, the right of petition, the freedom of the press, of speech and debate, by which alone we assert these rights, and by which alone they can be peaceably, patriotically, or successfully asserted. The Whig party is composed of men, more intelligent as a general thing, more independent, disinterested, and humane than their opponents. They have shown, that as a party, they can neither be moved by the violence nor seduced by the corruption of Slavery. The

very first act they performed on their accession to power in 1811, was a sacrifice to principle unparalleled in the history of party contests.—I mean the rescission of the gag-rule. I have regarded that act as the principal cause of their overthrow.*

Had they shown the same subserviency to slaveholding tyranny interest, and ambition, as the Locofocos have ever done, had they for the sake of Federal offices, honors and emoluments re-enacted that rule, and yielded up all the important *committees* to that habitual jealousy and arrogance, which Locofocos have done nothing but fawn upon and confirm—they would have been in power now ; and *they*, instead of Democrats, falsely so called, would have had the offices and would have become, like them, the base deceivers, or the contemptible fools of Tyler. And I look upon it as a cheering evidence, not only of the progress of our cause, but also of the prevailing moral soundness of the American people, that a party which lost power so virtuously and nobly, is about to recover it with interest.

And now, friend Fulton, what shall we say of the other side. I would rejoice, and regard it as the greatest kindness, if you would show me how I can vote for any one but Henry Clay, or how I can omit voting, without helping Polk and Slavery. For many years I have refused to vote at all, unless the political parties put up men who would do Anti Slavery work ; and then I have voted indiscriminately for Whigs or Locos. I did so upon the ground that Slavery is such a master principle of injustice, corruption, and ruin, in the administration of the Government,—so pervades, colors and controls every important measure, appointment and department, that I have come at last to believe that an office-bearer, who is prepared for Anti-Slavery work, can do but little harm, and one who is not so prepared, but little good, whatever he may think on the other questions now, or likely to be, agitated among us. In the present Congress, and in the last, the few Locos favorable to abolition, found themselves on all the most important questions, voting with the Whigs.

The Locofoco party, containing, I cheerfully admit, individuals who have acted upon principles, and with an independence which does them the highest honor, is, nevertheless, profligate and pro-slavery. In Congress and the State Legislatures, they have trampled on our dearest rights, and on the cardinal principles of their pretended creed, in order to retain power, and get office, by supporting the tyrannical encroachments, and the destructive and degrading demands of Slavery. They have plumed

* See Wise's letter to the Gilder dinner party, Virginia 1841.

themselves on a strict regard to the right of instruction. They have constantly claimed that Senators elected, for six years, ought, in cases of a change in their States, to accommodate their principles to that change, or resign. Yet, at the Baltimore Convention, under the whip of their slave-masters, every man of them, (if they are men,) though determined to do a specific act, requiring, if done in good faith, but a single day, boldly and shamelessly turned their backs upon their past professions, and upon the positive and deliberate instructions of their respective constituencies and States. Why was this? Because Van Buren was not willing to sacrifice *everything* for Texas and Slavery, and Polk was.— Texas and Slavery have become the *Shibboleth* of the party. General Jackson, the old soul of the Texas conspiracy, well and long known as a slave-trader, was the father of the Locofoco nomination for President. Hence the candidate is called "Young Hickory." Jackson's arm struck down "his friend," Van Buren. This is demonstrable. It is true that he wrote a letter to the Convention in favor of Van Buren. But it appears by a subsequent letter, that he had previously determined that Van Buren could not be nominated. He says that he made up his mind "with great regret, that the position of his friend on the Texas question, rendered his nomination impossible." Jackson's wish was father to his thought. Mr. B. F. Butler, Mr. Van Buren's *fidus Achates*, did not communicate Jackson's letter in favor of his "friend," until the nomination was made, the instructions of the great democratic party, set at naught, and Mr. Van Buren's prospects blasted forever! Then Mr. Butler produced the letter. Now let it be borne in mind that Butler went to the Hermitage soon after the appearance of Van Buren's Texas letter, was in consultation with Jackson many days, and came fresh from the odor of his sanctity, to the Convention, bearing the letter which he withheld from those to whom it was addressed! Would he have dared to do this unless he had been authorized, and the whole matter previously arranged between him and Jackson? The conclusion seems irresistible, that the letter was written not to aid Van Buren, but to be used after he was slain, to pacify the honest but mistaken, deceived, defrauded, and insulted Democrats of New-York, New England, and Ohio; and to retain them in the leading strings of that ignorant, unprincipled and unscrupulous demagogue, who has been for fifteen years conducting them to perdition, and who is still as much the head of the party as he is the soul of the Texas conspiracy.

But Henry Clay is a slaveholder, and some of my abolition brethren think that to support a

slave holder, under any circumstances, is to be recreant to the cause. I do not mean to be recreant to the cause of the slave. I glory in it, and would not exchange "for Rothschild's wealth or Sir Walter's fame," the satisfaction I derive from serving it.

I do not know an Abolitionist, who I think would support a man for the presidency, merely because he is an Abolitionist. Then is it not inconsistent to oppose one merely because he is a slaveholder?— The reason is as superficial in one case as the other. The first and most important question in both is what is the candidate capable of doing, and what, if elected, *will he do*, for the cause? We vote not for names, but for things, for systems, for the known and settled policy of a party. Mr. Clay could not, even if so disposed, refuse to carry out the distinctive principles of the Whig party. For example he could not without meanness and perfidy of which I believe him incapable, interpose the executive influence as Tyler did, to reprieve the infamous "21st Rule," should the Whigs, as they assuredly will, on the first Monday of December, 1845, demand its death. The maintenance of the right of petition, the freedom of speech and of the press, and opposition to Texas, are, and have long been as much Whig *tenets* as the tariff. Let us recur to some of the facts. In the year 1836, on Pinckney's resolution that our petitions should be "neither printed nor referred, but laid on the table without further action," 62 Northern Democrats, 1 Northern Whig, and 56 Southern members voted in the affirmative; and 43 Northern Whigs, 17 Northern Democrats, and 6 Southern members voted in the negative.— Majority in favor of the resolution, 53. Had 27 of the Northern Democratic votes in favor of the resolution, been given against it, it would have been defeated, and the country saved from the tyranny, the disgrace, and the evil example of the whole series of outrages, committed by Congress upon the first principles of liberty, and the fundamental rights of the people. In January 1837, on the proposition of *Huvers* of Kentucky to renew the Pinckney resolution, 70 Northern Democrats, 3 Northern Whigs, and 56 Southern members without distinction of party, voted in the affirmative; and 42 Northern Whigs and 11 Northern Democrats, 13 Southern Whigs, and 3 Southern Democrats, voted in the negative. In December 1837, in consequence of a motion and speech of Mr. Slade, a leading Whig, in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, Patten's resolution that our petitions, and all other papers touching the abolition of Slavery, or the American slave-trade, should be, laid on the table, "without being debated, printed, read or referred," was brought in. On this resolu-

tion, 51 Northern Democrats, 1 Northern Whig, and 70 Southern members, voted in the affirmative; and 59 Northern Whigs, and 15 Northern Democrats in the Negative. This was the first *gag law*, as it not only suppressed the right of petition on the part of the people, but also the right of their representatives to make a motion, or utter a word in the House. Of the Northern men who opened their mouths to take the gag, 41 were Democrats, and 1 Whig. All the Southern members, 70 in number, united to put it in and bind it on. Of those who made resistance, 59 were Northern Whigs and 15 Northern Democrats. Majority for the resolution, 48. Of course, less than half the Northern Democrats who voted for it, could have defeated it.

On the 12th day of December, 1838, the same resolution was moved by *Atherton*, of New Hampshire, with the addition of an insidious phrase, viz: "Upon presentation thereof" which created a doubt whether petitions were in reality *received* under this resolution. Thus with stealthy step, cowardice and conscious guilt advanced to the open outrage of the following session. That the manner of proceeding might be in keeping with the object, the mover made a lengthy speech, and closed by moving the previous question, which his accomplices sustained, wisely precluding reply. The vote stood for the resolution, Northern Democrats 53, Northern Whigs 1, Southern members, without distinction of party, 72; against the resolution, Northern Whigs 62, Northern Democrats 12, Southern Whigs 3, Southern Democrats 1.

The preceding resolutions being simple orders of the House, were subject to the will of the majority, if they should see fit at any time to refer a petition, but the slaveholders, encouraged by these repeated proofs, that their Northern mercenaries feared neither God nor their constituents, proceeded to give the mortal stroke to the freedom of debate and the right of petition. On the 28th day of January, 1840, the House voted to add to its standing rules and orders, (which cannot be dispensed with or rescinded during the session without a majority of two-thirds,) the following, viz:—

"No petition, memorial, or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territory, or the slave-trade between the States or territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever."

As usual, the previous question was called and free breath stifled. There were in favor of this infamous rule, Northern Democrats 27, Northern Whigs 1, Southern members 84; and against it, Northern Whigs 61, Northern Democrats 38, Southern Whigs 4, majority 6; wanting only three of the Northern Democratic votes to have defeated

it. This rule has been regularly renewed at every session, except when the Whigs were in power, with ranks as yet unbroken. At the opening of the first session of a Whig Congress, Mr Adams moved to rescind the rule, arguing the motion as a necessary branch of Whig policy in opposition to the gag and *lettre de cachet* system of the party just then discarded by the nation. From this doctrine not a Whig expressed dissent. In favor of the motion there were Northern Whigs 78, Northern Democrats 30, Southern Whigs 4; against it, Northern Democrats 21, Northern Whigs 1, and Southern members 82. On motion of a Democrat from Pennsylvania, this vote was subsequently reconsidered and the gag restored by a majority of 2. At the beginning of every session since, Mr. Adams, unfaltering and untiring in the discharge of his duty, and as confessedly the leader of the Whigs in the House of Representatives, as he is of those favorable to abolition, has repeated his motion, for the rescission of the gag rule. At the regular session of 1841-2, the rule was sustained by a vote of 96 to 88; majority 8. In the session of 1842-3 it was sustained by 106 to 102; majority 4. In these cases the division was just about the same as in the preceding. I have not at hand the means of an accurate analysis, but the Washington letters of those periods, represent the Northern Democrats to have gone, as a party, with the slaveholders for the gag, and the Whigs, almost to a man, against it. At the late session, after the gag rule had been stricken out by a majority of 20, its friends avoided the effect of that vote by refusing to adopt the rules as amended; and a previous motion having been adopted that the rules of the preceding session be observed until otherwise ordered, the 21st, now the 25th Rule, was thus left in full force. This is the last vote which has been taken annulling the right of petition, and the liberty of speech, and debate.— There were for it, Northern Democrats 26, Northern Whigs 0, Southern members, without distinction of party 62; against it, Northern Whigs 44, Northern Democrats 38, and Southern Whigs 5; majority for the gag, 1.

The Northern Democratic vote against the gag, which on the preceding evening was 55, had been reduced during the night no less than 27! Of these, 8 were absent or *dodged*, as it is called, and 9 changed their votes. No Whig changed his vote, and there was but one, Hardin of Illinois, absent.— Duncan, of Ohio, and Davis, of Indiana, had both made speeches against the rule, and on the final question voted against it; but when they found that a majority had voted the same way, and that the slave-driving Virginia speaker was making an awful pause before declaring the decision of the House,

they rose and changed their votes! This is a common trick. The effect is to arm members, capable of resorting to it, with a *casting vote*. The encouragement which such a practice offers to bribery is obvious. No doubt it had been arranged during the preceding night, that the Northern Democrats should continue to take the gag and force it into the mouths of the Whigs; but wishing to do this with as little wear and tear of conscience, and as little expense of popularity at home as possible, they doled out their support in this sparing manner. I have no doubt that if ten or twenty more Democratic votes had been wanting, they would have been forthcoming. How characteristic of the party, which two months afterwards nominated Polk and Dallas, in obedience to the mandate of the same slave masters, and in desertion of him, whom their constituents in 17 States had determined upon argument, to prefer! One of the considerations which the slaveholders urged most strenuously upon their Northern allies, was that bereaving them of their gag was part and parcel of the Whig policy, that Adams was the Whig leader of the House, that he had always fought this rule, and that to yield in a matter to which such notoriety and importance had been given, would be nothing less than to manufacture a great triumph for him and the Whigs, which could not fail to affect the ensuing election. This argument I have reason to think, prevailed in some instances where every other had failed.

The cases which I have thus cited give a very narrow and imperfect view of the action of the Whig party as bearing on Slavery. If we will examine, we shall find them presenting at every point a steady front of opposition to the tyranny, the encroachments, the threats, and violence of Slavery.

It is generally known that the territory of Florida has passed laws by which colored seamen, citizens of the Free States, or of countries in amity with the United States, are, upon arriving there, arrested and confined at the charge of the vessel, and if not taken away, and the costs paid before a certain day, then they are sold into slavery for *ninety nine years*.— Other cruelties, fatal to liberty, and shocking to humanity, are enacted by the same law. On the 1st of January, 1813, a Whig from the State of New-York, Mr. *Morgan*, moved that the Committee on Territories inquire into the expediency of annulling said law. Mr. *Weller*, of Ohio, a Democrat, immediately moved to lay the motion on the table, thus cutting off discussion.

The vote stood for *Weller's* motion, Northern Democrats 29, Northern Whigs 3, Southern members without distinction of party, 70; against it, Northern Whigs 66, Northern Democrats, 12.— Another attempt to annul this audacious act was

made by Mr. *Briggs*, now the Whig Governor of Massachusetts, but with a similar result.

On the petition of a large number of the citizens of Boston, Mr. *Winthrop*, Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, made from that committee a report against all laws of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana, authorizing the confinement, whipping, and sale of colored seamen from the free States, who may enter the ports of the United States, lying within the geographical limits of those States. Five thousand extra copies of this report were ordered to be printed for general distribution. This is a matter of course in every case of an elaborate report on a subject of general interest. But it was soon discovered by the slaveholding fanatics, that there were reasons given in this report which it might be dangerous to publish. A motion was therefore brought forward at the next meeting of the House, to reconsider the vote to print extra copies. It might have been expected, (by one not acquainted with them,) that the "peculiar" friends of "the poor," of "State rights," "sailor's rights," "free-trade," and "the diffusion of information among the people," would have promptly frowned upon a movement so opposed to all these pretensions, and so depreciating to the Democratic stock in trade. Not at all; 36 Northern Democrats, 2 Northern Whigs, and 71 Southern members, without distinction of party, voted for the reconsideration; and 69 Northern Whigs, 8 Northern Democrats, and six Southern Whigs against it. The motion to print was then laid on the table by a similar vote. But Mr. *Rayner*, an able man from North Carolina, had made a minority report, he being the only dissenting member of the Committee! and it was concluded by the Southern members, to be best upon the whole to print Mr. R's report, and of course, the extras. And now, this being signified, and a motion made to that effect, these 26 Northern Democrats faced to the right about, and went unanimously for the extra copies!

On the first of January, 1813, Mr. *Shade*, now about to be made the Whig Governor of Vermont, presented in the House of Representatives a series of resolutions against the Christian slave-trade, carried on in sight of our Capitol; and he asked a dispensation from the gag, in order to move them.— For granting the dispensation there were Northern Whigs 61, Northern Democrats 12; against it, Northern Democrats, 38. Northern Tyler men, 1, Northern Whigs 2. Southern members without distinction of party, 72.

In October, 1812, Monterey, the Capital of California, included within an immense territory, as large as Texas, which our Government has long been endeavoring to buy, was taken possession of

by a United States Squadron, under Comodoro Jones. I have no doubt that this was done in pursuance of secret, as it was in conformity with the spirit of public orders of Tyler and Upshur, the latter being then Secretary of the Navy. One proof of this is, that Jones has never been brought to trial or an inquiry. I predicted this, as you may see in the pamphlet to which I have referred, from the moment that the extraordinary outrage was announced. I believed it to be a phenomenon, throwing out a little light from a dark and awful system of gradual usurpation by means of a little force and a great deal of diplomacy, solely for the aggrandizement of the slave power, and the slave interest in this republic. The active brain of the late Secretary of State had conceived, and his unblenching hardihood and ambition prepared to execute it. It will be remembered that the invasions and depredations committed by General Jackson in Florida, whether they were avowed or disavowed by our Government, did greatly facilitate the negotiation for the surrender of that province. Mr. Adams moved a resolution condemning the Monterey outrage, the most base and unprovoked of its kind.—For this resolution there were Northern Whigs 58, Southern Whigs 16; and against it, Northern Democrats 31, Northern Tyler men 1, Northern Whigs 1, Southern Members, chiefly Democrats 44. Such a vote as this, and other circumstances incline me to rely on Southern Whig Slaveholders for patriotism, and respect for the rights of men and of nations, much more than upon Northern servile Democrats.

The effect of slave labor to kill land, and the consequent impatience of a large portion of the South to possess themselves of the rich reservations of the Indians, were at the bottom of the perfidious and expensive scheme of banishing those original and rightful proprietors. The Whigs always opposed this dishonest and cruel policy; and they opposed the Florida war, a branch of it.

In 1836, Calhoun, pursuing the recommendation contained in the annual message of President Jackson, brought into the Senate a bill to establish a censorship upon newspaper and other printed matter, circulated through the Post-Office. The bill proposed to make every petty postmaster a censor, to invest him with authority to establish his *index expurgatorius*, and to circulate or suppress at his pleasure, any publication. It made him the sole judge, in secret inquisition, of what he should suppress, and what he should permit to go to the people. For this bill, 16 Democrats and two Whigs gave their yeas, and against it, 9 Whigs and 9 Democrats their nays. There was a tie, and Mr. Calhoun called aloud, "Where is the Vice President,"

[Mr. Van Buren] He was on hand, and immediately resumed the chair, and gave his casting vote for the bill; but it was finally defeated, chiefly by the Whigs.*

On the 6th of February, 1837, the question of the reception of Anti-Slavery petitions was first raised in the Senate. A great number of those petitions having been presented, the motion was made that they be received, whereupon Mr. Hubbard, of New Hampshire, moved that this motion lie on the table. In favor of this, there were Southern Democrats 20, Southern Whigs 5, Northern Democrats 7; against it, Northern Whigs 9, Northern Democrats 5, Southern Whigs [Henry Clay] 1. I have referred to this vote, because it was the first of the kind, and not because it is most favorable to the character of Whigs. They have given many better votes on the same question. On the 8th of February, 1839, Mr. Clay of Alabama, moved to lay the question of considering Morris's resolution against Slavery and the Slave-trade, on the table. For this there were Democrats 20, Whigs 2; against it, Whigs 10; including Clay, of Kentucky, and Democrats 5.

In February, 1839, and again in January, 1840, the Whig Senators, with Mr. Clay at their head, voted against the armed occupation of Florida, and they resisted every attempt of Jackson and Van Buren's administrations, to involve us in a war with Mexico, ostensibly for a bundle of claims, mostly trumped up, but in reality to cover robbery with the specious name of conquest. This was a shadow of the Texas treaty, cast across the path of the Whig Senators; and they behaved precisely as we should wish them to do, if we could now dictate in presence of the event, the manner of preparing for it. I think that the Whigs did at that time save us from war, a war having no real object but the extension and security of Slavery; and that they again saved us by the timely conclusion of the Ashburton Treaty. There is no doubt that the Annexationists saw with regret and chagrin the healing of a wound, which they wished to keep open, both as increasing the chances of war, and as furnishing means of irritating the North at any moment into a blind concurrence in their wicked and deep-laid scheme of slave aggrandizement. I am persuaded that if that Treaty had not been made and ratified while Tyler thought it still politic to keep measure with the

* The following was the vote on the passage of the bill to be engrossed. Whigs 14 ayes.

YEAS—Black, Brown, Buchanan, Calhoun, Cuthbert, Goldsborough, Grundy, King, Ala King, Ga Moore, Nicholas, Preston, Rives, Robinson, Tallmadge, Walker, White, Wright

NAYS—Benton, Clay, Davis, Ewing, Ill. Ewing, Ohio, Hendricks, Hubbard, Kent, Niles, Morris, Prentiss, Ruggles, Shepley, Southard, Swift, Tondinson, Wall, Webster.

On the final question, Mr. Goldsborough, returned to his Whig friends, and voted against the bill.

Whigs, it would nothave been made at all, and we should most likely have been in the midst of a war with Great Britain and Mexico at this moment.

On the 14th of June, 1838, the Texas question was brought before the Senate by Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, (a man who seems to have mistaken his party,) in the shape of a resolution for the re-annexation of Texas. To keep properly before us the affinities of important agents of the Texas plot, I observe here that this individual threatened in the Senate, to hang, in spite of all the Governments upon earth, including the Federal, every Abolitionist who set his foot in South Carolina; and that he boasted of the Compromise Act as the work of "the Southern whip." Mr. Preston's resolution was laid on the table, 24 to 14, Clay, Webster, and all the Whigs, except 2, voting in the affirmative; and 12 Democrats, including Benton Calhoun and Walker, in the negative. The Whig party also voted against the recognition of the independence of Texas, on the 13th of February, 1837, and on the 1st and 2nd of March, following. On the latter day, the motion was to reconsider the vote of recognition passed on the preceding. Upon this, the Senate were equally divided: and if the Vice President had been as ready to interpose his casting vote against this Texas conspiracy, as against the liberty of the press, we should have been saved from the disgrace of a measure which experience has shown to have been unjustifiable in every view.

But while these things were transpiring in the Senate, one of the most remarkable and well-sustained parliamentary contests that can be found on record, was going on in the House of Representatives. During three years, a system of suppressing petitions, motions, and calls on the Executive for information relating to Texas had been in practice. The remonstrances of five Northern Whig Legislatures, viz: those of Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island Ohio and Michigan, together with the petitions and remonstrances of more than a hundred thousand citizens, against Annexation, had been laid on the table without reading, printing, or debate. Darkness as deep as the dungeons of the Inquisition, enveloped Congress and the nation,—and while the savage yell of war burst upon Mexico from our Presidential mansion, and was echoed by convenient committees of both Houses, nothing was allowed to be drawn from the Executive, or said on the floor, or printed, which could throw any light on the real cause of the intended war. In this deplorable and perilous state of our public concerns, a ray of light from the Annexationists themselves penetrated the heavy overhanging gloom. It was a light which, like that of hell, made "darkness visible." The Legislatures of Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee

and South Carolina, had passed resolutions in favor of Annexation, and directed them to be laid before both Houses of Congress. They were presented, but were laid on the table like the rest, under a rule which, like Phalaris' bull, was now found as fatal to the inventor, as to his victims. This unforeseen consequences operated like an electric stroke upon the slave fanatics of the House. The idea of suppressing the voice of sovereign States began to appear shocking and intolerable to the "State Rights" and "Strict Construction" party!

"This even handed justice
Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips."

Never was this saying of nature's great interpreter more curiously verified. The annexationists now demanded the reference of their resolutions, and the result was that those of Massachusetts and other free States, and all the petitions and remonstrances against Annexation, having got at last into respectable company, were permitted under its wing to be ushered into the presence of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee, however, did not, if their own statement is true, deign to look at one of them, but reported "that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of them, and that they be laid on the table." Mr Waddy Thompson moved to recommit, with instructions "to report a joint resolution directing the President to take the proper steps for the Annexation of Texas to the United States."

To this, Mr. Adams moved an amendment, declaring that there was no power under the Constitution to annex a foreign State; and that any act of Congress, or Treaty attempting to annex Texas to the United States, would be null and void, and ought to be resisted and annulled by the people.—And now Mr. Adams had the floor, and never was floor better occupied than was this by him, during "the morning hour" from the 16th of June to the 7th of July. He laid open the awful and tremendous slave-trading, and land speculating conspiracy. He has won ample and immortal honors in overthrowing, in 1837 and 1842, formidable combinations, to expel him from the House or degrade him in it; but the historian will probably dwell with most enthusiasm upon his timely and masterly exposure of the Texas conspiracy in spite of all, in the midst of the efforts of the majority to hold the gag in his mouth. Then was the real battle unconsciously fought. It is not too much to say, that if an exposure of the plot had not been made then, it would have succeeded now. On all these occasions Mr. Adams was backed by the body of the Whig party. So was Mr. Giddings when he dared to question the principles propounded by Calhoun and acted upon by the Executive, in the case of the

Creole. Without this support, those honest and intrepid servants of the people would, in all probability, have been overpowered and crushed, and ambition, avarice and fraud—shrouded in impenetrable mystery—would have completed the work they had prosperously begun. Just before this Dr. Channing had addressed his letter to Mr. Clay on the subject of Annexation; and I well remember what confidence and satisfaction were diffused throughout the anti-slavery ranks by the reported reply of Mr. Clay, viz: that Dr. Channing need be under no apprehension that Texas would be annexed. The relief which many an anxious bosom experienced from that declaration is still recollected by Abolitionists; and that recollection speaks trumpet-tongued of the high and well known trustiness and honor of Henry Clay.

* * * * *

I hope you will weigh well the votes I have stated and the facts to which I have referred; and that you will carry the investigation still farther, for there is plenty of room. Hundreds of such votes, given by the respective parties in Congress and in State legislatures, affecting deeply the success of our sacred cause, and serving in their time as steps by which we mounted towards our present secure eminence, are now indistinctly remembered or entirely forgotten. The few I have cited are enough to show the intrinsic character and natural bias of the parties. When they were given and placed upon record, there was not much for a politician to hope or fear from Abolitionists. Men felt free, and rather more than free to act towards us just as they felt. It was deemed a merit to treat us with contumely, and political capital could be thus made.

I see, therefore, in these votes proof that the Whig party are possessed of humanity, independence, considerateness, habitual reverence for natural and Constitutional rights, for justice, and the free working of the human soul. They cannot be driven by Executive power or popular frenzy, nor seduced by the plaudits of the many, nor the blandishments of the few, to do essential wrong to their country, their constituents, or to other nations.—The misfortune of their opponents is to have no character except what circumstances, temptation, and opportunity may impress upon them for the time.—I should feel that nothing valuable, which they could assail with applause, profit and impunity, would be any where safe. Constitutional barriers have been no more heeded by them than twigs in the way of the wild boar. They take their name from *demos* as the Jesuits did from *Jesus*, and they hold (if to anything) to the fundamental maxim of that once formidable society, "the end sanctifies the means." They have defined their position

thus:—"All's fair in politics." "The spoils of the victors." These are the alpha and omega of their political ethics and their political economy. One of themselves to whom *they* have always given a high character for honesty and sagacity, uttered the most memorable of his *memorabilia*, when he said "their only cement is the cohesive power of public plunder."

Strict limitations and a jealous watchfulness of Executive power is a democratic principle; and the apprehension that the Federal Constitution had provided for an Executive, which would be too strong, and in process of time become dangerous to liberty, was one of the great grounds of opposition by the anti-Federal, or original Democratic party, to the formation and ratification of this Constitution. But for the last sixteen years, to go no further back, the Democrats, falsely so called, have sustained and encouraged Executive acts, experiments, and adventures, far transcending the Constitution, and scorning its obvious and cautious restrictions.

Strict economy and accountability in the use of the people's money is a democratic principle, but Jackson and Van Buren's administrations run up the Government expenditure from *thirteen to thirty-three millions* per annum; and the accounts and superintendence of the national finances were so loose and negligent that a single officer carried on embezzlements during seven or eight years to the amount of more than a million of dollars without detection, and with impunity.

Non-interference of federal officers in elections is a democratic principle. I remember when the Democrats of Boston considered that it would use them up to have a custom house officer take any part in their popular meetings and elections, except to listen of an evening and deposite his vote. Now it is common in all the principal cities for Executive dependents to be the officers and orators, and sometimes to constitute the main and even entire body of a political gathering. They have even left their posts, traversing the country day and night, and insulting it with their venal harangues.

The protection and encouragement of home manufactures is an old democratic principle. Being a Jeffersonian Democrat, one of the first things I did on entering into active life, was to join an association, formed by my elder political brethren, for the encouragement of American industry. We took a pledge to wear no clothes except of American manufacture. This was in 1813. We continued the association, and kept the pledge, until, by the act of 1821, "the American system" was supposed to be firmly and definitively established.

The observance of justice and neutrality, and the maintenance of "peace, friendship and honest com-

merce with all nations" is an old democratic doctrine, which used to be blazoned on our banners; and when, in 1806, an expedition "was set on foot" and "prepared" in the United States, to attack Texas, Mr. Jefferson ordered military detachments to take positions on the Ohio and Mississippi, and sink, destroy or capture the boats and men descending those rivers for that purpose. Under the late and present democratic dynasties, such expeditions have proceeded openly, and not only without molestation, but with the aid of officers of Government, whose sworn duty it was to prosecute such offenders to condign punishment. At this moment a self-constituted committee sits in the Capitol, and sends forth under the franking privilege, and through the organs of the Democratic party, invitations and arguments to the idle, and lawless, and rapacious, all over the country, to combine, arm, organize, (either as soldiers or emigrants, it makes no difference which, not at all!) and march, rob, and murder a friendly and unoffending people, with whom we have solemn, and on their part, unbroken treaties of limits, peace, friendship, and commerce. The worst thing about it is that this great and dangerous misdemeanor, for which our laws have provided the punishment of fine, and imprisonment for years, *i. e.* for the mere "setting on foot" or "preparing" such an expedition, has grown so common and customary, that the country has come to regard it with a callous indifference. If, as the sequel of these harmless proceedings, privateers unloosed from every port, and manned by villains of all nations, and especially Texans and Americans, shall sweep our commerce from the ocean, we shall remember with bitter and unavailing regret, the apathy with which we are looking upon the daring and criminal manifestoes issued by R. J. Walker, W. W. Payne, and the editors of the Washington Globe.

It is a democratic principle that office be given to the most worthy; but they have come to be generally bestowed upon inferior and bad men, and it has been officially assigned as a reason for not removing them, when detected in public robbery, that their successors would probably be equally unprincipled, and more hungry.

It is a democratic principle that Executive offices, except the highest judicial and departmental, ought not to be conferred upon the representatives of the people; and yet, in eight years only, Jackson appointed more members of Congress to offices, many of them inferior and gainful merely, than all his predecessors together.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of petition, and the diffusion of information among the people, are cardinal points of democracy. But the Democrats have gagged the representatives

of the people, have attempted to impose a censorship upon the press for the comfort and security of Slavery, and have voted in innumerable cases against printing for dissemination among the people, memorials, resolutions, and remonstrances of sovereign States, and reports, and diplomatic correspondence, which would have informed the people of corrupt and high-handed acts done and designed to be done in their abused name. The right of petition has been openly trampled down and ground under the heel for ten years, and the national organ of the party, (the Democratic Review,) has propounded and maintained, without dissent on the part of a single Democratic press, that:—

"The absence of such power [Constitutional power to grant the prayer of a petition] is not necessary to confer the right of a refusal to receive.—*A settled prejudgement or predetermination on the part of the body under its high responsibility to conscience and to public opinion, is sufficient.*"

This is the power of the Cæsars, and of the Norman conquerors, "*Sic volo, sic jubeo, sic rector.*—*Stat pro ratione voluntas.*"*

Anti-Slavery, or equal, impartial, and universal liberty is the greatest of Democratic doctrines.—The Anti-Federalists, or original Democrats, opposed the adoption of the Constitution on this very ground, among others, that contrary to the whole gist of the American revolution, it permitted the enslaving of human beings, and conferred upon their enslavers political power, just in proportion as they violated this first principle of a free republic. But modern Democracy has become the chief prop of Slavery.

And why is all this? It is because Democrats have allied themselves with Slavery for the sake of the federal offices, dignities, and emoluments, and the price they have stipulated to pay is blind obedience and entire submission to the will of slaveholders. And inasmuch as none but inferior and dishonest men would embrace such corruption and submit to such degradation, hence it has happened that such extensive and continued depredations have been committed upon the Treasury of the Nation; and hence also the repudiation of the fundamental and self-evident doctrine of Democracy, that offices and honors should be bestowed upon the most worthy.

I need not say what party is the complete antipodes of the Locofoco on all these points. I might add to them a great many others, subordinate, perhaps, in importance, but bringing up contrasts equally striking; and I now put it to you, to every Abolitionist, and to every discerning man in the

* The ancient form in which the Norman Kings of England used to enact laws. The meaning is, "Thus I will, thus I order, thus I veto. My will stands for reason."

land, whether the main political reliance of the friends of justice, humanity, and universal emancipation must not necessarily, in this country, be placed upon the Whig Party. And this Whig Party goes security for Henry Clay's fidelity to their known principles and habits of action, and their long established system of policy.

* * * * *

But Clay needs no security. He is a man, who would be more likely, from a false sense of honor, to keep a bad promise than he would, for want of common honesty, to violate a good one.

Indeed the question has not been raised by any party or person, whether Henry Clay would keep a promise; but some have denied that he has made one. If he has not done it, and done it clearly and beyond cavil, then I oppose him to the death; then will I traverse the land day and night, calling upon the people to awake from their fatal security. But first let us see whether Henry Clay is really trying his hand at a swindle. A mistake in this matter would not only be very unjust to him, but extremely discreditable and injurious to ourselves. We must take all his words together. This is a rule which we apply to the meanest wretch arraigned at the bar of justice.

In the first place, as to the means by which Mexico has been dismembered, Texas severed from her, and put *de facto* in a condition to treat for Annexation, he says:—

“The signal success of that revolution was *greatly aided, if not wholly achieved*, by citizens of the United States, who had migrated to Texas. The success, if they could not always be prevented by the Government of the United States, were furnished in a manner, and to an extent which brought upon us some national reproach in the eyes of an impartial world. And in my opinion they impose on us the obligation of scrupulously avoiding the imputation of having instigated and aided the revolution with the ultimate view of territorial aggrandizement.”

Secondly, as to the *motive*, he says:

“It is useless to disguise that there are those who espouse, and those who oppose the Annexation of Texas, upon the ground of the influence which it would exert in the balance of political power between the two great sections of the Union. I conceive that no motive for the acquisition of foreign territory would be more unfortunate, or pregnant with more fatal consequences to the Confederacy, than that of obtaining it for the purpose of strengthening one part against another part of the common Confederacy. Such a principle, put into practical operation, would menace the existence, if it did not certainly sow the seeds of a dissolution of the Union. It would be to proclaim to the world an insatiate and unquenchable thirst for foreign conquest or acquisition of territory. For if to-day Texas be required to strengthen one part, to-morrow Canada may be required to add strength to another, and after that might have been obtained, still other and further acquisitions would become necessary.

“Suppose Great Britain and France, or one of them, were to take part with Mexico, and by a manifesto, were to proclaim that their objects were to assist a weak and helpless ally to check the spirit of encroachment and ambition of an already overgrown republic, seeking still further acquisitions of territory; to maintain the independence of Texas, disconnected with the United States, and to prevent the propagation of slavery from the United States, what would be the effect of such allegations upon the judgment of an impartial and enlightened world?”

“I was aware, too, that holders of Texas lands, and Texas scrip, and speculators in them, were actively engaged in promoting the object of Annexation.”

Thirdly, as to the consequences, he says:

“Under the circumstances, if the Government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would acquire along with it all the encumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. *Annexation and war with Mexico are identical*. Now for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the object of acquiring Texas. I know there are those who regard such a war with indifference, and as a trifling affair, on account of the weakness of Mexico, and her inability to inflict serious injury upon this country. But I do not look upon it thus lightly. I regard all wars as great calamities, to be avoided if possible, and honorable peace as the wisest and truest policy of this country. What the United States most need, are union, peace, and patience. Nor do I think that the weakness of a power should form a motive, in any case, for inducing us to engage in, or to depreciate the evils of war. Honor, and good faith, and justice, are equally due from this country towards the weak as towards the strong. And if an act of injustice were to be perpetrated towards any power, it would be more compatible with the dignity of the nation, and in my judgment less dishonorable to inflict it upon a powerful, instead of a weak foreign nation. But are we perfectly sure that we should be free from injury in a state of war with Mexico? Have we any security that countless numbers of foreign vessels, under the authority and flag of Mexico, would not prey upon our defenceless commerce in the Mexican Gulf, on the Pacific ocean, and on every other sea and ocean? What commerce, on the other hand, does Mexico offer, as an indemnity for our losses, to the gallantry and enterprize of our countrymen? This view of the subject supposes that the war would be confined to the United States and Mexico as the only belligerents. But have we any certain guarantee that Mexico would obtain no allies among the great European Powers? Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may. What it is, I do not know certainly; but the least I have seen it stated at is thirteen millions of dollars. And this responsibility will exist, whether there be a stipulation in the treaty or not, expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas.”

Fourthly, as to the *conditions* on which he leaves it to be inferred that he would or might consent to Annexation, he says:

“I have hitherto considered the question upon the supposition that the Annexation is attempted without the assent of Mexico. If she yields her consent, that would materially affect the foreign

aspect of the question, if it did not remove all foreign difficulties. On the assumption of that assent the question would be confined to the doing the considerations which belong to it, embracing the terms and conditions upon which Annexation is proposed. I do not think that Texas ought to be received into the Union, as an integral part of it, in direct opposition to the wishes of a considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy. I think it far more wise and important to compose and harmonize the present Confederacy as it now exists, than to introduce a new element of discord and dissent into it. In my humble opinion, it should be the constant and earnest endeavor of American statesmen to eradicate prejudices, to cultivate and foster concord, and to produce general contentment among all parts of our Confederacy. And true wisdom it seems to me, points to the duty of rendering its present members happy, prosperous, and satisfied with each other rather than to attempt to introduce alien members, against the common consent, and with the certainty of deep dissatisfaction. Mr. Jefferson expressed the opinion, and others believed, that it never was in the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution to add foreign territory to the Confederacy, out of which new States were to be formed. I did not believe that any Executive of the United States would venture upon so grave and momentous a proceeding, not only without any general manifestation of public opinion in favor of it, but in direct opposition to strong and decided expressions of public disapprobation.

"If, without the loss of national character, without the hazard of foreign war, with the general concurrence of the nation, without any danger to the integrity of the Union, and without giving an unreasonable price for Texas, the question of Annexation were presented, it would appear, in quite a different light from that in which, I apprehend it is now to be regarded."

"In conclusion, they [his opinions] may be stated in a few words to be, that I consider the Annexation of Texas, at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure comprising the national character, involving us certainly in war with Mexico, probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and not called for by any general expression of public opinion.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

H. CLAY."

This letter, which was written at Raleigh, on the 17th of April last, though evidently untidied, possesses a charm which no study could impart. It is easy, frank, and natural expression of sentiments which, whether right or wrong, carry irrefragable evidence of being habitual to the writer. The general views are large, humane, and upward. They come as gracefully as distant harmony over spirits, which have a petition for their country and their kind better than the hard query of death reasons, and the everlasting play of life. But be- forehand I had been informed that Mr. Clay wrote the letter during an afternoon in the Senate-chamber of North Carolina, and that it was interrupted every half hour by callers. I have observed that the particular points of every description, which are op-

posed to him, have either obtained altogether from publishing it entire, or have been reluctantly drawn into it, by the special exertions of their Whig neighbors. This is very significant. It is "silence that speaks." It is the "unwritten music" of Democracy, for once "harmonious."

In respect to the views on the particular subject, I felt constrained, by a regard for truth and justice, to say at the time, that they appeared to me satisfactory. I cannot here offer so extended a commentary as I wish. I would recommend to every person who may peruse these remarks, to recur to the entire letter. It will not weary; it will never be stale. It condemns the means and motives of the proposed acquisition, and earnestly deprecates the inevitable consequences. The conditions on which it is inferable that he would be willing to admit Texas, are such as, under any supposable state of facts, must forever exclude it. They are:

1st. The consent of Mexico. This will never be given so long as that country retains its independence. Mr. Poinsett was instructed by Mr. Clay, under Mr. Adams, to negotiate, and to offer a million of dollars for Texas. There were then very few Americans in it, and but a small population of any kind. Slavery had not then been abolished in Mexico, and the decree of abolition been resisted with arms and bloodshed, by a pack of conspirators from the United States; the subject of slavery had been less attended to among us, than any other in the whole cyclopedia!

"Oh no, we never mention her;
Her name is never heard."

I well remember being told at that time by a man of considerable distinction, who unknown to me, was a great Texas land jobber, that the Government were negotiating for the cession of the territory. So far from feeling any jealousy of the scheme I regarded it with patriotic pride, as I had done the recent acquisition of Florida. The speculator showed me a big map, and I felt individually elevated when he gave me the flattering assurance, (of which I still remember the very words,) "Sir, you will have the whole of it; it will be all yours." I am confident that the feelings of every one, who knew of the existence of the negotiation, were at that time similar to mine. The attempt therefore, to attach to Adams and Clay a particle of the guilt and responsibility of the conspiracy of 1829, and downward, is as devoid of reason as it is of honesty.

But Mr. Poinsett, upon sending the Mexican Government, upon the subject of a cession of the territory, found them so averse to it, and indeed so critical about it, that he never made the proposition in a formal manner. It would seem, from newspaper publications in Mexico, and from a work on

that country by Mr Ward, at that time British Charge d'Affaires, that Mr. Poinsett, under the instructions of Jackson, did volunteer the offer of a loan of ten millions upon a mortgage of the country.

Mr. Ward observes that Mr. Poinsett did not state what security he should propose for the redelivery of the territory upon the reimbursement of the loan! The occasion of this offer was a new and final attempt of the Spanish Government to reconquer Mexico. This proposition was considered by Mexico as mean and insidious, inasmuch as it took advantage of a period of peril and distress, and an empty treasury, to drive a bargain for her birthright. The indignation was aggravated by the consideration that the then Constitution, and every Constitution of Mexico, forbade the alienation of any portion of the national domain. The Mexican press has always spoken bitterly of this affair, stigmatizing our Government as a pawnbroker. He [Poinsett] entered into deep and dangerous intrigues, to elevate to power a party and a chief who were expected to be more accommodating; but when this had been accomplished at the cost of violating the Constitution—for Guerrero had the votes of 9, and Pedraza of 11 States—it was found that there was such an intense exasperation of the people against our Minister, that he could neither effect the object of his labors, nor remain in the country. Under the pressure of the universal indignation against him, the Mexican Government was constrained to request his recall. President Guerrero performed this task with expressions of personal friendship and good will towards the Minister. Well he might, for Poinsett, by his most unwarrantable interference, and his masonic cabals, had made him President; but he could not keep him so. In less than a twelvemonth he was deposed, and generously pensioned: but on engaging in a insurrection, he was made prisoner, tried, condemned, and executed. So much for being the tool of a foreign intriguer.

Anthony Butler, Poinsett's successor, was an absconding debtor, and a Texas land jobber. He was appointed solely because he was known to General Jackson as a man stimulated by avarice, luxury, and misery, and capable, by his utter destitution of virtue and honor, of pursuing the darling object through all the dirty ways of intrigue and corruption. It has been said that Jackson made this appointment with some reference to the fitness of the person for the employment. But so strong and lively was the excitement both in the people and Government on account of our designs upon Texas, that he did not, for nearly three years, venture to revive the subject of the cession, and he writes to Jackson that he considered it prudent to keep quiet "until the subject should be completely lost sight of by the people." He also observes that a party had risen into power "which his predecessor [Poinsett] declared to be so hostile to the United States that it would be in vain to expect from them anything like justice." Fortunate for the United States that it was so, and that they were not treated according to the deserts of their rulers! Poinsett had been instructed by Jackson and Van Buren to offer as high as five millions of dollars for Texas, and this instruction was renewed to Butler; but subsequently, upon his representing to Jackson that there was "stumbling block in the way, which he must remove," Butler had leave to come to Washington for the purpose of conferring personally with the President and Secretary of State, about this "stumbling block." He came, and the result of

the consultation was that he was authorized to apply *half a million of dollars more* for consummating a treaty of Annexation, with a declaration on the part of Jackson, that this Government would have nothing to do with designating the persons to whom that sum should be paid. Butler was told that the means he proposed were "of an equivocal character," and that "no confidence was felt in his success;" but he was likewise told that he *might go back and try*, and this license was accompanied with no restriction as to the means to be used, although the admission had just been made that *the means*, which he proposed to use, were "of an equivocal character." I can not elucidate this point as I could wish, without documents, which are in the Department of State, and have been withheld from Congress and the country. The declaration that "no confidence was felt" in Butler's plan, was intended to throw dust in the eyes of the American people; for in reality, Jackson did feel so much confidence in it, that he now directed Butler to include in the negotiation *Upper California*, a territory larger than Texas, and making with Texas, about 800,000 square miles, or 500,000,000 of acres, being half of the entire republic of Mexico! The upshot was, that a scheme of downright and rank bribery was arranged between these worthies, and Butler departed anew to carry it into execution, with a stringent and repeated charge to close the negotiation, and communicate the result, so that the business could be consummated in General Jackson's administration. Jackson's own words at parting with him were:

"Proceed to Mexico, and urge with all your force, a speedy conclusion to the negotiation, so as to let us have the result, if possible, by the meeting of Congress."

In one of his letters to Jackson, Butler said:

"It will require a few months to get everything in motion; but I pledge myself—mark me—I give you my pledge that *your administration shall not close without seeing the object in your possession!*"

Jackson at length, from some cause not fully disclosed, became angry and impatient, and suddenly sent to the Senate a nomination of a successor to Butler. On being apprised of this proceeding, the latter gentleman vented his grief in a long letter to Mr. Forsyth, from which the following is an extract, pointing with prodigious significance upon their mutual accomplices and co-conspirators, and most particularly Houston, in Texas.

"The dismissal he [Jackson] now gives me, only anticipates my own determination. Nothing but the deep interest which I felt in seeing the affair of Texas brought to a successful determination, would have induced me to remain here so long. The affair, in so far as regards our Government, may, perhaps be considered as at present concluded; and how far my failure in effecting the object may be attributed to the indiscretion of certain persons who *object to be in the confidence of the President, and to retail his opinions and declare his purposes*, will be for aftertimes to disclose. I AM IN POSSESSION OF ALL THE FACTS, AND A PRECISE COLLECTION THEY ARE."

This letter was dated January 15th, 1836, at which time the revolution in Texas had been commenced. The signal for that was given immediately upon the failure of Jackson's last hope in the negotiation.

While Butler was in Mexico he practised leaving

money to small traders at 30 per cent. Some of these cases became the subject of judicial investigation, and the loans were declared forfeited for usury. He smuggled goods under the ambassadorial privilege of importing articles free of duty for his own use. There was a tobacco shop in Mexico which he stocked with Havana cigars. He refused to pay his board and washing, and pleaded his privilege as Minister of the United States to exempt him and his property from attachment. He assaulted an American citizen in the streets with a large knotted cane, and he threatened by letter to assault and chastise in a public manner, Gen. Torwell the Mexican Secretary of War.

I have been informed by a respectable American merchant, long resident in the city of Mexico, that Butler was so infamous in his private character, that no American gentlemen held intercourse with him. His recall was requested by the Mexican Government, and as he tarried and continued his outrages after the arrival of his successor, he was ordered to quit the country. Other disgraceful details might be given, but these are a sufficient specimen of the consequences of such a system of appointments as crept into the Government with Andrew Jackson, and has continued ever since.

The Mexicans having in the beginning given the emigrants land as a charity at their own solicitation, having exempted them from taxes and duties for ten years, protected their industry, and passed laws for their accommodation with a kindness and liberality altogether unparalleled—have been deeply wounded by the ungrateful and treacherous return which a portion of the emigrants, with the help of their American allies, have made. Citizens of the United States from being the most beloved and trusted, have become the most odious of all foreigners. If there ever was a deep seated and inextinguishable national resentment, it now exists in the bosom of Mexico towards the Texans, and their American allies. Divided on questions of internal government and policy, they are perfectly united in determined hostility to these. This is a spell of power which can make them unite, and fall orderly into the ranks. The common designation of the Texans for a great many years before the war was "los colonos ingratos," the ungrateful emigrants. The Mexicans are generous, hospitable, and brave; they are not generally possessed of so much energy or physical strength as Americans, but they have large pertinacity.

I now put it to you whether it is possible for that people, so long as they retain a national existence, to give their consent and aid to the consummation of the conspiracy, which has been operating almost twenty years to irritate, insult, rob, degrade them, and cause most of their national calamities! Depend upon it they have determined to risk all on the Texas issue, having made up their minds, after long and painful experience, that if they do not now fight for their rights, they will soon have to fight us for their existence; unless happily other men shall be placed in power at Washington, and wiser, just, and humane counsels shall there at length prevail. If Mr. Clay had named no condition but that of the consent of Mexico, I should consider that on this ground alone Annexation is impossible.

Secondly Mr. Clay declares he will not agree to annex Texas in "decided opposition to the wishes of any considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy." This, I understood at first, to mean a State or a section, and this construction has been confirmed by Mr. Clay in a late communication to the

editor of a paper in Alabama. In that he says:

"I consider the Union a great political partnership; and that new members ought not to be admitted into the concern at the imminent hazard of its dissolution. Personally, I could have no objection to the Annexation of Texas; but I certainly would be unwilling to see the existing Union dissolved or seriously jeopardized for the sake of acquiring Texas."

It is a principle of law that no new partner can be admitted into a partnership without the consent of each of the old ones. Mr. Clay mentions particular States, in view of whose repugnance to the measure, he laid down his rule. These were Ohio, Vermont, and Massachusetts. In my opinion, the decided opposition of any one State, would create the contingency upon which Mr. Clay's promise would attach. But, beyond all doubt, the decided opposition of three States would bind him in terms to oppose Annexation. Is not this sufficient? Does it not secure the object at least for four years. I have not the least fear that the time will ever come when we cannot get a dozen States to resist to the last the extension of slavery and the slave-trade, by the agency of this nation; or the imposition of taxes upon the honest industry of this people, for the purpose of bestowing principalities upon the ingrates the renegades, and conspirators of Texas, and the blacklegs of the United States.

Other objections stated by Mr. Clay are in their nature permanent, and immovable, that for instance against the game of adding to one part to strengthen it against another part of the confederacy. This unquestionably is the primary motive. Mr. Clay knew it; it has been formally and officially avowed by Tyler, Upshur, Colhoun, Southern Legislatures and the leading Southern presses. This objection is based upon a state of mind, inseparable from Southern Slavery, and it cannot be obviated by anything short of the abolition of Slavery. But indeed the whole tenor and spirit of the letter is eminently just, benevolent, and pacific, wholly and tetotally incompatible with the injustice, fraud, and violence, which have marked the design, the means, the inception, and progress of the Annexation conspiracy.

The declaration of Mr. Clay that "personally he has no objection to the Annexation of Texas," has been much advertised upon; and it is the only passage of all that he has written on this subject which our able friend and coadjutor, George Bradburn, has thought proper to quote or to allude to, in showing Mr. Clay up, and putting him down. I think, that on reflection, Bradburn will be sensible that it is as unworthy of himself and the cause, as it is unjust to Clay. Friend Bradburn teaches, if I understand him, the doctrine that danger of seeming to be what we are not, is a justification of not acting out what we really are; and that he would not vote for a Whig candidate though he should himself see it to be right, if it would seem to his Anti Slavery and reforming associates to be wrong and inconsistent, and so forfeit their respect and confidence. If it would have this effect, there must be something radically wrong in them—and they ought to begin to reform themselves. Surely such tyranny would be as intolerable as Slavery.

Mr. Clay has written yet another letter, of which the following are the most material parts:

"It [Texas] had been wrested from the dominion of Mexico by citizens, many of whom went armed from the United States. The war between Mexico

and Texas had not been terminated by any treaty of peace. Mr. Tyler not only did not ask the consent of Mexico, but he announced that her assent to the annexation was altogether unnecessary."

"A powerful opposition had arisen in the United States against the Annexation of Texas to them. Several States had declared through their Legislatures, against it, and others, if not whole sections of the Union, were believed to be adverse to it.—This was the opposition to the measure to which in my Raleigh letter, I alluded, when I spoke of a considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy. I did not refer to persons, but to States or sections.

"Under such circumstances I could not regard the Annexation of Texas, at this time, as compromising the honor of my country, involving it in a war, in which the sympathies of all christendom would be against us, and endangering the integrity of the Union. I thought then, and still believe, that national dishonor, foreign war, and distraction and division at home, were too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas."

"I have no hesitation in saying that, far from having any personal objection to the Annexation of Texas, I should be glad to see it, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I do not think that the subject of Slavery ought to affect the question, one way or the other. Whether Texas be independent or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of that institution. It is destined to become extinct at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population. It would be unwise to refuse a permanent acquisition, which will exist as long as the globe remains, on account of a temporary institution."

Here Mr. Clay reaffirms the leading and essential points of his first letter, but there is a new matter from which I entirely dissent, viz: "I do not think that the subject of slavery ought to affect the question, one way or the other. Whether Texas be independent or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of slavery. It is destined to become extinct at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population."

It is remarkable that Mr. Clay and the Liberty Party should agree in belittling the bearing which the Texas question has upon slavery. Both are wrong, and both are refuted by themselves. For many years the leaders and the presses of the Liberty Party were in the habit of denouncing Annexation as a wily and flagitious contrivance for the relief and support of slavery, and as demanding a vigilance more wakeful, and a resistance more dread than any, or all other pro-slavery movements, of the times. This was the unvaried tone of them all, until the Whig party in honest and inevitable conformity with their action in Congress and in State Legislatures for the last eight years, proclaimed uncompromising hostility to the scheme, and struck the treaty dead. Up to that time, proceeding upon the ignorant and unwarrantable assumption that neither of the great parties intended as such to oppose it, the Liberty Party leaders and presses gave out that it would be a compensation for the extreme profligacy and perniciousness of the measure, that it would prodigiously increase their party. Some even piously affected to believe that Providence permitted a pro-slavery plot so

dreadful, to be hatched for that very purpose!—But as soon as it became apparent that the Whigs must necessarily be the centre of this resistance, and that capital could not be made of it by a minor party, the "Third Party" leaders suddenly changed their tone, and declared Annexation a bagatelle, and opposition to it a Whig stalking-horse! The slaveholders of Southampton, and some twenty counties more, were in such consternation at Nat Turner's insurrection, that they had breath only to cry, "arms, arms," "havoc," "inhuman butchery," "the tomahawk and scalping-knife are nothing to this," but as soon as humane and patriotic men from the western and middle parts of the State proposed, in view of that event, measures for abolishing slavery,—those same slaveholders turned round and ridiculed the insurrection as "a petty affair," and made a great deal of fun of it! The Loco-focos did not give it a more decisive proof of their depravity, as a party, when for the sake of Texas and slavery, they turned their backs in a trice upon their professions, their instructions, their constituents, and the majority rule, than did the Liberty Party leaders, in their sudden somersot on Texas. If these movements should be sustained by the mass of disinterested and reflecting men in those parties, it will inspire more fear and anxiety for the fate of this republic, than the curse of slavery, terrible as that has ever been, has caused, or ought to cause.

Mr. Clay's declaration, countenancing, (though not intending to do so,) the fictitious course of the Liberty Party leaders is abundantly refuted by himself in the Frankfort discourse, from which I gave extracts in the first part of this letter. The drift of that discourse is to prove that the filling up of the slave territory to the full extent of the demand would reduce the price, and make slave-planting a losing business; and he specified "that very fact of the annexation of Louisiana," as one great cause of the enhancement of the price of slaves, and consequently the prolongation of slavery. Now then, the question is reduced to a simple sum in the rule of three. If it has taken forty years to fill up Louisiana and Florida, so as at length to make the price of slaves begin to descend, and the hopes of humanity to rise, how long will it take to fill up Texas, which will furnish more and better land for planting, than we have ever had yet? Moreover this land is better and more extensive adapted to sugar planting, and of course slavery would there assume its cruellest character. In the very sentence containing this mistake, Mr. Clay relies on "the laws of population," for doing away slavery. What is this but a new proof from himself of the error with which it is coupled. How are the "laws of population" to operate any more than municipal laws on subjects perpetually eluding their grasp, first by going to Texas, and then, as they inevitably will) beyond it, "pouring their lives out," in the words of Wise, "without restraint, and finding no limit but the Southern Ocean." This objectionable opinion does not impair the pledge previously given by Mr. Clay. It only shows what we all knew before, that he is opposed to annexation for not so many and not so good reasons as we are.

Mr. Clay has said other things at various periods, from which I dissent, and from which every Abolitionist must ever dissent from and condemn. The most obnoxious of them was said in the Senate, in February, 1839, viz: "Were I a citizen of the planting States—the Southern or Southwestern

I have opposed, and would continue to oppose, any scheme of emancipation, gradual or otherwise.

It is the inhumanity of this sentiment, Mr. Clay, which on every other occasion, he has always refused to it, to wit, "without removal or compensation."

Indeed the speech in question evinces that qualification. This does not, however, diminish the bearing of the sentiment in any degree, nor does it in some degree diminish the sincerity of his cherishing and uttering it. It is publicly and repeatedly condemned it, and is better of it now. In one respect, however, the opinion of its author has undergone a radical change. For a long time I did believe that he was contrary to his conviction, to curry favor with the South, hoping thereby to obtain their votes for the Presidency. That he cherished such a hope was influenced by it, I do not doubt; but I am sure he did not act the hypocrite. The hope has been habitual to him, and was sincere. In the Frankfort discourse, delivered ten years ago, he expressed himself to the same effect, as follows:

"The question were submitted whether there should be an immediate, or gradual emancipation of all the slaves in the United States, without their removal. Emancipation, painful as it is to express the sentiment, I have no doubt that it would be unwise to attempt at this time."

All his words are to be taken together to ascertain the meaning, so are his actions to be all taken together to determine his real character. Mr. Clay, from a natural, reared, and educated amidst the prevailing influences of Slavery, and though poor and dependent upon popular favor, started in life as he started the popular current, and demanding of the great boards of Kentucky the abolition of Slavery. And his wise and philanthropic counsels were, there would in all probability have been followed by a little for Abolitionists to do at this time. His intention, and not the success of an action, is the real criterion of its merit. He has been generous, responsive, and boundless sympathy for the struggles of all peoples for freedom. The more we read his trumpet-toned speeches in the ranks of their liberating armies; and the more we read of Spaniards, in their respective countries, for self-emancipation, were comforted, and encouraged, and emboldened by his great and friendly words. There was a time when I looked on Henry Clay as the champion of the Liberator of all peoples. He is to Lafayette, to man in all the world, what I look on him with more affection, a more intimate friendship, than Henry Clay. Having been in the course with that class of men, gathered around the remains of George at an interesting ceremony, and in the history, I may be permitted to say that I now contemplate Mr. Clay with more affection, not because he has changed, but because I have not changed. I have learned to love him, and to regard him as "one of our blood," and I am comforted by their Creator with certain immunities, and in His name I go for three millions, irrespective of color, race, party, or religion. I have, however, always believed that Henry Clay had a good heart. His professional services were freely given, and with eminent success, and he always reduced slaves. Their condition was from the very beginning of his career,

his deep sympathy. "They were torn," he has often said "from their native home by fraud and violence." "Husbands were torn from their wives, parents from their children, brethren from each other, and every tie cherished and respected among men, was violated." "They are rational beings like ourselves, capable of feeling, of reflection, and judging of what naturally belongs to them as a portion of the human race." "All the fruits of their exertions are reaped by others." "They are generally indifferent, therefore, to the adverse or prosperous fortunes of their masters." "There are undoubtedly many exceptions in which the slave dedicates himself to his master with a zealous and generous devotion." "Slavery is wrong, all wrong—wrong to the master, a grievous wrong to the slave." "It is evil, continually evil." "It is a stain upon the nation." "Among the acts of my life which I look back to with most satisfaction, is that of my having co-operated with other zealous and intelligent friends, to procure the adoption of that system [the Pennsylvania plan of emancipation] in this State."

These I believe to be unsophisticated effusions of Henry Clay's heart. In respect to the oppression of the Indians, he has uttered again and again deep tones of grief and indignation. I anticipate from you a remark which is natural and unavoidable to one in your and my state of mind. These humane sentiments and just views only render the more inexcusable his own practice of oppression! God forbid that I should gainsay this. That Henry Clay should have polluted himself by forming and continuing a personal connection with a system which he so early saw to be "all wrong," is one of those striking incongruities in human conduct which equally pain the heart and puzzle the brain.—But it is an inconsistency no greater nor worse than the cut-throat Christianity of warring nations! It is difficult for us in the free States to make due allowance for the force of slaveholding habits and customs, the seductive influence of surrounding example, and the quieting effect of popular sanction and sympathy. It is a problem yet to be solved, how far moral deviations may be extenuated by the false lights and insensible currents that beset the voyage of our life. Every just mind does necessarily take these into account. In the divine mind they make the difference between "many stripes" and "few." No sane man will pretend that the human sacrifices of ancient Carthage, Britain, and Mexico, and of modern Africa and Hindostan, were and are murders! that Calvin beheaded Gruet and burned Servetus from malice; that the gentle Melancthon maliciously approved of it; or that Judge Sewall, of Massachusetts, while he was writing "The Selling of Joseph," probably the first treatise against negro slavery that was ever published—was at the same time committing murder in sending his fellow citizens to the gallows for witchcraft! But Mr. Clay were much more objectionable than his worst enemies pretend, still the choice is betwixt him and Polk—betwixt the circumscribing, and early extermination of Slavery, and the incalculable and irreparable national horrors that emanate from it, and the bad finite extension and strengthening of them all. He who is not for the former, is for the latter.

Respectfully your friend and laborer's friend,

D. L. CHASE.

W46







WERT
BOOKBINDING
Granny, Pa.
Jan - Feb 1968
WERT BOOKBINDING

